

Arizona Corporation Commission
Utilities Complaint Form

Investigator: Carmen Madrid	Phone: <<< REDACTED >>>	Completion Date: 10/30/2015 8:40 AM
Opinion Number: 2015 - 127177	Priority: Respond within 5 business days	
Opinion Codes: Rate Case Items - Opposed	Opinion Date: 10/30/2015	
First Name: C.	Last Name: Nagle	Account Name: C. Nagle
Address: <<< REDACTED >>>		
City: Hereford	State: AZ	Zip Code: 85615
Home: <<< REDACTED >>>	Email: <<< REDACTED >>>	
Company: Sulphur Springs Valley Electric Cooperative, Inc.		Division: Electric

Nature Of Opinion

Docket Number: E-01575A-15-0127

Docket Position: Against

From: Dutch [mailto:dutchpat@cox.net]

Sent: Thursday, October 29, 2015 7:28 PM

To: Utilities Div - Mailbox <UtilitiesDiv@azcc.gov>

Subject: Net-metering proposal by SSVEC

I could not find a way to submit my comments other than this.

SSVEC rate proposal for solar systems:

Practically everyone who installed a solar system on their home did a financial analysis before investing thousands of dollars. Now, the utility company wants to change the factors used in the analysis. If SSVEC can compute an average cost for the infrastructure, then why not charge everyone the same fee? This suggested rate change will now cause the installation of a solar system to be a financially bad decision for a home owner.

If it costs \$78 per month to service one customer, why are they suggesting that non-solar customers pay \$25 per month while solar customers pay \$50 per month? Where is the rest of the \$78 being buried? Why not \$78 for everyone?

The utility companies pushed alternative power sources to reduce dependence on fossil fuel, now they want to penalize us for doing so. Isn't there a cost saving in a cleaner environment? Isn't there a cost avoidance in not being fined by the government for not meeting standards? Isn't there a value in having a more modern infrastructure? Isn't there a saving in not having to build a new power plant?

SSVEC is offering energy audits, zero percent interest loans to improve energy efficiencies and publishing '101 no-cost or low-cost tips to reduce energy consumption' all at no charge. These costs are absorbed by all of us. Shouldn't there be a charge for these services?

SSVEC claims that they need to charge more for those using net-metering solar systems to cover the costs of their infrastructure. The contract between SSVEC and the private solar system owners clearly states that the cost of purchase, installation, repair and maintenance for private systems is the sole responsibility of the system owner.

The point SSVEC does not seem to understand is that the private solar systems are "part of their

Arizona Corporation Commission

DOCKETED

OCT 30 2015

DOCKETED BY

RECEIVED
2015 OCT 30 P 1:57
UTILITIES DIVISION

**Arizona Corporation Commission
Utilities Complaint Form**

infrastructure" since they produce power that is fed into the public grid. This piece of the infrastructure is cost-free to SSVEC since they did not have to buy, install, or maintain these systems. If they wish to be fair they should include these savings in their infrastructure costs. Perhaps the solar people are subsidizing the non- solar people.

SSVEC sells my excess power which costs them zero cents per KWH to other customers at their regular charge of approximately 13 cents per KWH. This seems like a profit for SSVEC.

Does SSVEC see the irony here? Trick people into being more efficient then change the rules later to penalize those who fell into their trap.

I hope the Arizona Corporate Commission has the intelligence to find a fairer way to respond to the problem.

I would suggest that solar system owners buy batteries, become self-sustaining and discontinue SSVEC service. The cost could be justified when looking at the proposed rate hike.

C. Nagle, retired

7630 S. Rockwood Dr

Hereford, AZ

378-7229

Investigation			
Date:	Analyst:	Submitted By:	Type:
10/30/2015	Carmen Madrid	Telephone	Investigation
Opinion noted and filed in Docket No. E-01575A-15-0127. closed			
